NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

THE REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,

Reviewed by a Member of the 27th Congress.

The report of this officer is always read with a good deal of interest. It relates to one of the most important departments of the Government—to that Department, at any rate, which sustains all the others. It is, besides, made the duty of the Secretary, in his annual report, in addition to the estimates of the public revenue and public expenditures, to lay before Congress "plans for improving or increasing the revenues from time to time," being, as expressed, "for the purpose of giving *information* to Congress."

The theory of our Government is, that it is a Government of the People. The early practice under it was for the people, by their delegates in the two Houses of Congress, to originate the laws intended for their own government, leaving the Executive branches to their appropriate duty of carrying them into execution. The theory of monarchy is, that all laws emanate from the Sovereign, and his Ministers only have the initiative of them. General Jackson was the first President who undertook to practice upon the monarchical theory. His successors of the same dynasty follow his example, and we are here, in this Secretary's report, presented, not with a *plan*, but arguments in favor of a *plan*, to change entirely the system by which our revenue has been collected since the establishment of the Government. This system, more especially adopted in 1816, and sustained for thirty years by all our subsequent legislation, is pronounced by this modest servant of the people as "*unequal, unjust, exorbitant, and oppressive.*" This system he proposes to change in favor of one of which he gives us, in many words, a confused outline.

We propose to examine, with all the respect due to a high officer of the Government, some of the assertions, theories, and speculations contained in this very extraordinary report.

His object, as we were long since informed by a letter under his hand published in the newspapers, was to bring the tariff down to the "*revenue standard.*" Of course, much curiosity existed to learn what he understood or intended by this cabalistic phrase. Without finding any very precise definition of the term, we have no difficulty at getting at his meaning, especially after comparing it with the President's Message, in which the theory is more plainly stated.

A revenue duty is one not only producing revenue, but must be so constructed as to avoid in the highest possible degree becoming protective. A revenue duty is antagonistical to a protective duty. A duty which, by design or accident, causes similar articles to those on which it is levied to be produced at home, so as to lessen the revenue, becomes thereby protective, and must be reduced. Discrimination may be made for revenue, but not for protection. A duty laid on articles of which none are imported cannot be *collected*, and is therefore clearly *unconstitutional*. These are the fundamental principles on which the new system is to be established. He thus states the object of the protective system:

"A protective tariff is a question regarding the enhancement of the profits of capital; that is its object, and not to augment the wages of labor, which would reduce those profits. It is a question of per centage, and is to decide whether money vested in our manufactures should, by special legislation, yield a profit of ten, twenty, or thirty per cent., or whether it shall remain satisfied with a dividend equal to that accruing from the same capital when invested in agriculture, commerce, or navigation."

It is difficult to say whether the above paragraph betrays a greater ignorance of the objects and grounds on which the protective principle was adopted and engrafted into our revenue system, or of the most common and universally admitted principles of political economy. The protective system was not introduced or advocated by the possessors of capital, nor for their benefit. It is a well-known fact that they were, with few if any exceptions, opposed to it. It was the patriotic democracy of the country which advocated and introduced the system. What was the argument? The country is wholly agricultural and commercial. In the existing policy of the world, we produce more than we can sell, except at prices miserably low. We have to buy our clothing, and other foreign productions, from abroad, at their own prices; in payment of which we are constantly being drained of our specie, to the derangement of our circulating medium, and paralysis of all business. The proposition is to hold out inducements to the merchants to withdraw a portion of their capital from foreign trade, and employ it in manufactures, and the domestic trade of their distribution. We shall thus withdraw a portion of our labor from agriculture, and convert producers into consumers. We shall thus furnish ourselves with at least a portion of the manufactures which we require, by the labor of our own citizens, and pay for them with those productions which we now find no market for, or a poor one. We apprehend the question was never started in these discussions, whether there was not danger that those who should be drawn into the new occupations would make too much money; because in those days it was considered a settled principle, confirmed by all experience, that any business yielding profits above the average rates is sure to attract capital and labor into it until the profits fall to the general level, or more usually for a time below it.

At any rate, the protective policy was adopted, and men of business employed their earnings in the new occupations to which they were invited by the policy and laws of the country, doubtingly and hesitatingly at first, but afterwards more freely and confidently. The most successful branch, and the one which has absorbed the greatest amount of capital, is the manufacture of cotton. The possession of the raw material on the spot, and the peculiar adaptation of machinery to produce great results in this manufacture, soon made it evident that the cotton manufacture was rapidly to become one of the leading interests of the country. Capital went into it freely and confidently. Its rapid extension has no parallel, and is only equalled in the corresponding reduction in the price of its fabrics. Its success furnishes the only ground of its denunciation. The manufacturers are growing too rich. That is the whole burden of the report. *Special legislation* in their favor. "*Another form of privileged orders.*" We regret to see a high officer of the Government descending to use the stereotyped slang of the party newspapers. But what we pass by in silence in the Evening Post, or in the ramblings of the laborious Bundelcund, ought not to pass without censure when coming from a Secretary of the Treasury.

In carrying out his views, we find some very extraordinary assertions. For instance, "Experience proves that, as a general rule, a duty of 20 per cent. ad valorem will yield the largest revenue." We should be glad to know what experience. Is it that of Great Britain, whose necessities require her to push her duties up or down to what she finds by experience to be the highest revenue standard? Her duty on tea is 2s. 1d. or 50 cents the pound, on all teas without discrimination, being at least 200 per cent. on the cost, producing, for the year ending January, 1842, the comfortable sum of £3,978,000 as revenue. Her lowest duty on sugar that year was 24s. the cwt. or 5¾ cents the pound, producing a revenue of £5,120,000, upwards of twenty-four and a half millions of dollars. It is true this duty on sugar has since been reduced, but for relief, not for revenue. Her duties on wines are 5s. 6d. the gallon, rum 9s. 4d., brandy 22s. 6d., tobacco 3s. the pound, producing together eight millions of pounds, or about forty millions of dollars, at rates varying from 300 to 900 per cent. on the value. So much for the experience of England. What is our own? Our highest tariff was that of 1828. Our greatest revenue was under it for the year 1831, being $30,312,851 nett, at rates of duty averaging 41 per cent. on imports subject to duty. (See doc. No. 3, 28th Congress.) Our lowest tariff was in operation in 1842, being less than 24 per cent. on the dutiable imports, and produced a nett revenue for the year of $12,780,173! So much for our own experience. We think it would puzzle Mr. Secretary Walker to furnish the evidence of what he pronounces to be so clearly proved.

Another assertion of Mr. Walker is, that the wages of labor have not augmented since the tariff of 1842, but that they have in some cases diminished. Now we find, on inquiry of the different agencies at Lowell, that the average earnings of the operatives have increased full one-third since the disastrous year 1842, or from $1.50 to full $2 per week for females, exclusive of board. But even this does not present a fair view of the full effect of the passage of the tariff of 1842 upon labor. At that time the proprietors were receiving no dividends, and waiting the action of Congress before deciding to stop the mills. Had Congress adjourned without the tariff, more than one-half the mills in New England would have stopped work at once. The reason assigned by the Secretary for his supposed fact is entitled to some notice. "As the capital invested in manufactures is augmented by the protective tariff, there is a corresponding increase of power until the control of such capital over the wages of labor becomes irresistible." That is to say, the greater the inducement to build mills, and the greater the amount invested in works which are wholly unproductive without hands to work them, the greater is the power of the mill-owners to drive hands into them; in other words, the power of labor to get high wages diminishes in proportion as the demand for it is increased. If a greater solecism was ever put upon paper, we should be glad to see it.

The whole force of the report is levelled against the tariff of 1842, as if that were some new abomination. It is pronounced "unequal, unjust, exorbitant, and oppressive."

Now, the fact is, the tariff of 1842 was modelled upon the tariff of 1832. That was adopted as the ground work; the principle was the same, as a comparison will show in the following table:

	Duties per tariff of 1832.	Of 1842.
Woollens	50 per cent.	40 per cent.
Flannels	16 cts. sq. yd.	14 cts. sq. yard.
Pig iron	10 dols. per ton.	9 dols. per ton.
Rolled iron	30....do.	25....do.
Other bar iron	18....do.	17....do.
Salt	20 cts. per bush.	8 cts. per bush.
Brown sugar	2½ cts. per lb.	2½ cts. per lb.
Cotton bagging	3½ cts. sq. yd.	4&5 cts. sq. yd.
Cotton minimum white goods	30....do.	20....do.
Cotton minimum dyed and printed	35....do.	30....do.

It will be seen that there was a general reduction on the highest rates of duty. That is to say, the tariff of 1842 is less protective than that of 1832. The only exceptions are in the articles of sugar and cotton-bagging, which cannot certainly be laid at the door of the Northern manufacturers. It is true, the general rate of ad valorem duties was raised from 25 to 30 per cent., but this was done wholly for the purpose of increasing the revenue. It becomes, then, a matter of some interest to inquire, under what circumstances the tariff of 1832 was passed? The national debt had been paid off, and a great reduction of the revenue was necessary. The Jackson party had decided majorities in both Houses of Congress; in the House of Representatives consisting of upwards of thirty. The tariff of 1832 was prepared with great care, on the principle of raising the necessary revenue, so disposed as to afford protection to our own industry in all its branches. Many of the protectionists, however, were not satisfied with the duty on woollen manufactures, high as it was, as not corresponding with the high duty on wool. The bill passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 132 to 65. It is somewhat curious to find amongst the yeas the names of James K. Polk and Cave Johnson. Of the nays more than one half consisted of those who voted against the bill as not high enough on woollens leaving not more than thirty who voted against the bill on principle, consisting of Mr. McDuffie and his converts to the forty-bale theory. In the Senate the same bill, fortified in the article of woollens, by an addition of seven per cent., passed by a vote of 32 to 16—Mr. Dallas being amongst those voting in the affirmative. Such was the position of the Democracy of the country on the principle of discrimination in favor of protection in 1832. None of its deformities were then discovered. But South Carolina did not like this bill. She adopted the theory that it imposed a tax of 40 per cent. on her exports. She threatened nullification and rebellion. General Jackson, at the next session of the same Congress, proposed a reduction of the tariff in order to appease this froward State. He admitted that "it would seem a violation of public faith suddenly to abandon the large interests which had grown up under the implied pledge of our legislation," and added "that nothing could justify it but the public safety, which is the supreme law."

The pretext for reduction was, that the tariff would produce too much revenue—that Congress had not carried out the reduction proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury in a bill which he had at the previous session furnished to the House of Representatives at their request. There was no foundation for this pretext, as was afterwards admitted by the Secretary himself in a document which he was called on to furnish, (Doc. 97, 2d sess., 22d Cong.,) showing that the tariff of 1832 actually made greater reductions than those proposed in his own bill.

But under this pretext what was called Verplanck's bill was brought forward, and the Jackson party were, most of them, drilled up to the mark of undoing their own work of the preceding session. But without success; for, after a violent effort, Verplanck's bill was abandoned. It was in this state of things that Mr. Clay's compromise bill was taken up by the defeated party, and carried through the House against the votes of the warmest friends of the protective system. Mr. Clay acted under the mistaken idea, put forward by the Administration, that the tariff of 1832 would produce more revenue than was required for the administration of the Government. Experience and our present debt have proved the contrary.

But with what face can the party, nay the very men by whose agency the tariff of 1832 was passed, now come forward denouncing the tariff of 1842—the same in principle, but milder and more moderate in all respects than that of 1832, as the abomination of abominations—as a new concoction of concentrated Whigery? Such is the spirit of party. The Baltimore Convention considered the vote of South Carolina necessary to secure the election of Mr. Polk, and the word went forth, *down with the tariff*. The affiliated presses of the party take up the note, and down with the accursed, the Whig tariff of 1842, is responded from the same throats which cried ay in favor of a similar tariff in 1832. Thus are the great interests of the country made the sport and foot-ball of selfish politicians in their eager pursuit of office. It is this action of it which makes so many of the statesmen of Europe, and some amongst ourselves, pronounce our system a failure. We do not agree with them. With so much of good we must expect some evil. We believe in a recuperative power which will eventually set things right. We must expect wrong measures, but they will work their own cure. It is possible to sound the depths of democracy too low.

Mr. Walker expresses particular dislike to specific duties, including the cotton minimums, which are, in fact, merely specific duties. In this he goes against the experience of the whole world. He will not find a mercantile man in the whole country to agree with him. The difficulty of guarding against fraudulent invoices has increased with the increase of our trade, and its tendency to fall into the hands of unscrupulous foreigners, with whom the custom of double invoices is notorious.

The carrying out Mr. Walker's views in this particular would not only put our whole system of revenue in peril, but introduce the widest system of fraud and perjury which the world has ever seen. Many of the continental tariffs, and the famous Zoll-Verein in particular, are wholly specific, manufactures of cotton, wool, and silk being rated by weight. The British tariff admits ad valorem duties in the fewest possible cases, and then subject to a home valuation, at which the Government officers are at liberty to take the goods on paying an addition of ten per cent. Mr. Walker's objection that specific duties, and especially the cotton minimum, throw unequal burdens on the laboring classes and poor, compared to the rich, has hardly the shadow of truth to support it; so far as respects the cotton manufacture, not even the shadow. It is a fact, which must be admitted by all who look into the matter, that all the coarser manufactures of cotton, all which possess substance and are most profitable in use by the laboring classes, are furnished by the American manufacturer on better terms than they can be had in any other part of the world. In this they challenge inquiry. The constantly increasing demand for export for this description of goods, to markets in which they meet the British in full competition, would seem to be sufficient evidence of this fact; unless, indeed, one would adopt the discovery of the sagacious Bundelcund, that *the manufacturers sell their goods abroad at one-half the prices which they obtain at home.* The Secretary quotes from document 306, 1st ses., 28th Congress, (Mr. McKay's report,) to show the high duties payable on certain manufactures of cotton, adding: "This difference is founded on *actual importation*, and shows an average discrimination against the 'poor on cotton imports of 82 per cent. beyond what the tax 'would be if assessed upon the actual value." Now, with all due respect for Mr. Walker, we must say, *there is no such thing*. He is utterly mistaken. No such importations have been made. No such horrid exaction has been practised upon the poor. His authority is the sixth column of table C, appended to that report 306, stated in the table itself to be: "The rates ad valorem of the duties under the present law, '*as estimated* in statements made to the committee, upon the 'authority of known and respectable merchants and importers 'in several of the large commercial cities." We find the explanation on page 72 of said report, in the "Price Current 'issued by Stewart, Thomson, and Lay, Manchester, January 31, 1843; with the *rate of duty* under the present 'American tariff added." Here we find precisely the same rates of duty, being those which *would be charged* on certain goods, *if imported*, as those given previously in the sixth column, very kindly estimated no doubt by some Manchester agent. Amongst them we find "stouts or domestics," (imitations of ours,) estimated to pay upwards of 100 per cent. duty, whilst they were actually selling lower in Boston or New York than the prices quoted in this very Manchester price current. This gross mistake of Mr. Walker is the more extraordinary, since the second column of this same table C gives the actual rates ad valorem on goods coming under the cotton minimums, as *made up at the Treasury*, upon the actual imports, being on the 20 cent minimum 49 per cent., and on the 30 cent minimum 43 per cent. Thus vanishes this grievance of the poor into thin air. But why, then, this heavy minimum duty on goods which require no such protection? The whole matter is fully explained in the memorial of citizens of Boston interested in the cotton manufacture, (Document 461, 2d session, 27th Congress,) from which we make the following extract from page 48:

"The foregoing analysis will have shown that the question of a protective tariff bears very differently on different branches of the cotton manufacture. The coarser fabrics, with which we supply foreign nations at the rate of about three millions of dollars per annum, in free competition with the British, it is quite obvious, *are very little if any way affected, by any tariff whatever.* The only effect of opening our ports to this description of goods at a very low duty, or no duty at all, would be the influx of the inferior British imitations made from Bengal cotton, but which would prove to the consumer intrinsically dearer than our own manufacture made from American cotton. So far as relates to the finer qualities of plain cottons, a very moderate square yard duty will protect the manufactures now in existence. It is in reference to the article of printed calicoes and other fancy goods that the question of the tariff assumes its chief importance," &c.

The great importance of the minimum consists in its tendency in constantly carrying the manufacture up into the finer and higher branches. In this particular it was never more effective than at the present moment. We agree to Mr. Walker's discrimination of "maximum revenue duties upon luxuries." It is not easy perhaps to say what are luxuries in this country, where labor has its luxuries as well as the rich; but we aver, so far as the cotton manufacture is concerned, that the effect of the maximum is to collect a high duty on the finer and more costly branches of the manufacture, without affecting the lower branches at all. So that, as a revenue duty merely, acting upon luxuries, it is the most efficient mode which can be adopted.

The chief argument, however, which is expected to overthrow the tariff, lies in the fact that the manufacturers are just now sharing large dividends—that the business is in fact too profitable. This is accompanied in the report by the allegation that the principle of protection is legislating for the *rich*, for *classes*, for the benefit of *capital*, for the *few* instead of the *many*. However false and absurd, this is the *cry* which is expected to break down the tariff, and there is little doubt it will succeed; for the party have set up the *cry*, and they have decided majorities in both branches of Congress. Against such a cry what will it avail to state that this prosperity is but the reflux of that tide whose long ebb in 1842–3 filled the hearts of the manufacturers with dismay? That action and reaction are as constant in the world of trade as in that of Nature? That, at all events, the regulating power is in full action, by which all profits in different occupations are soon brought to the same level by the unfailing laws of competition? It is true that manufactures have shared fully in the general prosperity, and there are instances in which the profits of the last year have reached twenty per cent. There are at Lowell nine companies manufacturing cotton, employing a capital of nine and a half millions. Of these five made no dividends during the entire year 1842. The dividends for the four years 1842, 1843, 1844, and 1845, average eleven and a quarter per cent. per annum on the capital, from which should be deducted about three-fourths per cent. for the risk of fire, leaving the actual nett earnings not over ten and a half per cent. per annum. This is something more than the same establishments will average since they have been in operation; and these are undoubtedly the most successful concerns in the country, far above the average. Another important fact: the greatest profits have been made by those mills making goods for foreign markets, on which of course the tariff has no bearing. About one-third of this profit has been in the advance of the raw material during the year, the most successful establishments having laid in their entire stocks before the advance, equal to about two cents the pound.

There is also abundant evidence that the cotton manufacture has been favorably affected in an equal or greater degree in Great Britain, and that their spinners have realized greater profits on their capital than any of our establishments whatever. What a bugbear is this clamor about enormous profits, special legislation for classes, and for the rich, when analyzed.

So far as there is any tangible argument in the report, it is the argument of the forty-bale theory, that a tariff of duties upon imports is in fact a tax upon exports. For instance, "the true question is whether the farmer and planter shall, to a great extent, supply our people with cheap manufactures purchased abroad with their agricultural products, or whether this exchange shall be forbidden by high duties on such manufactures, and their supply thrown as a monopoly, at large prices, by high tariffs, into the hands of our own manufacturers?" This is precisely the language used by Mr. McDuffie in nullification times. He follows him in saying that we demand specie from all the world to an extent which they cannot supply, at the same time, with singular inconsistency, he advocates the Subtreasury on the ground that it will facilitate a larger supply of American gold coin, and thus give greater security to all the business of the country. It is singular that the Secretary should have adopted this exploded theory at a time when the South is so decidedly repudiating it; and that he should use this argument in order to carry Northern votes, whilst the theory, as expounded by Mr. McDuffie, attributed the peculiar prosperity of the North to the very system of protection, only to be accounted for on the ground of its being a robbery committed on the South.

The Secretary complains that the manufacturers have not generally answered his circulars. Is that surprising? We know that some answers were prepared which were kept back on the ground that it was due to a proper self-respect. Mr. Walker had given public notice that his mind was made up to a reduction of the tariff according to a scale establishd in his own mind. His object, therefore, was not to collect information in order to form an opinion, but apparently to find evidence against the manufacturers. They thought, besides, that the proper tribunal for such an investigation is a committee of Congress. To such a committee they will readily exhibit every thing connected with the subject.

It would occupy too much space to notice all the curiosities of this report. The Secretary is utterly opposed to countervailing restrictions, as inefficacious—differing in this from the high authority of General Jackson, and in opposition to the testimony of Mr. Huskisson, who justified himself for his relaxations of the navigation laws on this ground solely. He quotes the repeal of the duty on cotton as a voluntary concession, when the fact is notorious that it was only owing to the representations of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce that the Americans were supplanting them in foreign markets in heavy goods, and that the small duty of 2s. 11d. the hundred weight operated to the extent as a bounty to their rivals. What was the British duty on cotton before the establishment of our tariff? From 1809 to 1814 25s. 6d. the hundred weight, or 5¾ cents the pound. From 1815 to 1819 8s. 6d. the hundred weight, or nearly 2 cents the pound. He greatly overestimates the value added to the cotton crop by manufacture; he supposes it increased in value sevenfold, which is nearly double the fact. He recommends, in case of war, a reduction of duties in order to increase the revenue. Mr. Gallatin, when Secretary during the war of 1812, recommended that the duties should be doubled, which advice was adopted. In fact, Mr. Walker seems to be acting under the spirit of contrariety to every thing tried and established.

We pass by his proposition for carrying on the whole trade of Canada through the United States; his drawback of one-half the duties where American exports would be taken in exchange; his population of eight hundred millions disabled from purchasing our products, by our high duties on all they would sell in exchange; the unfettered power of agriculture to break down all restrictions; his inflated currency repealing the operation of the tariff, &c.

In all honesty and sobriety we feel bound to say that such a number of unwarrantable assumptions, and such a medley of puerile crudities, never before issued from any department of our Government. But what of that? It is lauded to the skies in the organs of the party as *a new revelation in political science.* The policy is to be carried out; so be it. If New York and Pennsylvania are sick of their prosperity under the protective system which they established, so be it. But let the additional imports of twenty or thirty millions per annum, come in accordance with the object of the policy. Before the second year shall come round, *the currency will feel it, the labor of the country will feel it, Locofocoism will feel it*, or we are no true prophet.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF CLEMENS WEINZEL LOTHAR, PRINCE OF METTERNICH.*

FOR THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

This distinguished statesman, whose name appears for more than a quarter of a century in all affairs of State connected with the Austrian Empire, was born at Coblentz, on the Rhine, on the 15th of May, 1773.

He descended from an ancient Rhenish family, from which sprung many distinguished men.

After completing his studies at Strasbourg and Mainz, (Mayence) on the Rhine, he visited England, thence Vienna, which latter he chose as his residence. In 1795 he was sent Minister to the Hague, in which year he married the Countess Elenore von Kaunitz. Shortly afterwards he entered upon his diplomatic career as Austrian Minister to Westphalia, at the Congress of Rastadt. In 1801 he was appointed Minister to Dresden; in 1804 at Berlin, where, by his influence and advice the treaty of Potsdam of the 3d of November, 1805, was concluded, by which Austria, Russia, and Prussia bound themselves to unite in arms against Napoleon's gigantic plans. In 1806 Count Metternich was ambassador to France, where he remained until the memorable year of 1809, when, having been refused passports at Paris, Bonaparte's army then marching to Austria, he succeeded notwithstanding in reaching the encampment of the Emperor Francis at Komoen a short time before the battle of Wagram. He was then made Minister of State; and, on the 8th of October, same year, he was raised to the office of Minister of Foreign Affairs, in which capacity he negotiated the treaty with the French Minister Champagny for the peace Ungerich-Altenberg. In 1810 he accompanied Maria Louisa, Archduchess of Austria, as Empress of France to Paris.

Owing to Metternich's indefatigable efforts at Dresden, in 1812, the threatened outbreak in the North was prevented, by which Napoleon's plans were completely frustrated. With the assent of Russia, Prussia, and France, Minister Metternich transferred the business of the mediation to Prague. On the 10th of August, 1813, before the negotiations for peace had commenced, Napoleon's troops were in motion, when Metternich drew up, on the night of the 10th of August, the celebrated declaration of war between Austria and France; and on the following morning the Russian and Prussian armies had crossed the Bohemian borders. On the 9th of September, 1813, he signed the quadruple alliance at Toplitz, which was drawn up by himself.

In order to reward Metternich for his numerous and invaluable services, not only to the Austrian States, but to Europe generally, the Emperor Francis bestowed on him, on the evening of the battle of Leipsic, the title of Austrian Prince for himself and his descendants.

About this period Frankfort, Frieberg, Basil, Langres, Chatillon, Dijon, and Paris, witnessed the diplomatic activity and success of Prince Metternich. In the last mentioned city he signed the negotiated treaty of Fontainbleau with Napoleon. At this time the University of Oxford bestowed on him the title of doctor. He was honored, in 1814, at the Congress of Vienna, by the united assent of the assembled Ministers with the Presidency. He negotiated with Wellington and Talleyrand, at Pressburg, the peace of Saxony and Prussia. On the 20th of November, 1815, as Austrian Minister, he negotiated the second peace of Paris; and, in 1816, at Milan, the treaty with Bavaria, which was signed at Munich on the 14th of April. After which he accompanied the Austrian Princess Leopoldine, betrothed to the crown Prince of Portugal, to Leghorn.

In 1817 he concluded a treaty with the Roman See. He was equally distinguished at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818, at Carlsbad in 1819; also at Trappeau, Laibach, and Verona. In 1821 he was appointed Imperial and Royal Chancellor of House, Court, and State; and, on the death of Count Zichy, to that of Minister of State Conference; and, in 1826, he received the Presidency of the Ministerial Conferences for Home State Affairs.

Prince Metternich is Knight of the Golden Fleece and of all the first class of orders in Europe, except the English Garter. The King of Spain presented him with the Grandezzy of the first class with the ducal title; the King of the Two Sicilies with that of the Duke of Portella. He alone possesses the Grand Cross, established in 1813–'14 as a reward to illustrious men for civil services. The Emperor Francis, in acknowledgment of his eminently beneficial services to his country, granted him the distinguished privilege of emblazoning the Austrian arms in the middle of his own.

Metternich's ministry is regarded as the most brilliant and prosperous of the Austrian history. Since the Congress of Vienna, in 1815, when he held the first rank amongst the most eminent statesmen, he has exercised an influence and wielded a power unexampled in modern times.

In the internal regulations of the Austrian empire the fruits of his measures are evinced in the numerous and magnificent works of internal improvement which are being extended over the whole country, and the prosperous and contented condition of the people. Few countries at the present period, if any, exhibit greater enterprise in developing their resources, or in the improvement of all classes of their citizens. Prince Metternich, although seventy-two years of age his last birth-day, appears much younger than men of the age generally do. He is extremely erect in his person, affable, dignified, and courteous in his manners, temperate in all his habits. His attendance to business is unremitting; and, amidst the multiplied duties which devolve on him, he is cheerful, obliging, and polite to all, discharging his engagements with facility and ease. From one till five o'clock he generally devotes to his office. Two evenings in each week are set apart for receptions by the princess of the diplomatic corps; members of the court and others entitled to presentation from ten till twelve o'clock, at which the Prince is always present; and during the evening confers freely with such of the foreign ambassadors and ministers as may desire to consult or converse with him, which he does while walking to and fro in some of the adjoining saloons; after which he mixes with the company generally. Great deference is paid to him by all, from the highest to the lowest, who approach him. There is no stiffness of manner or arrogance of rank. His whole demeanor, whether in the transaction of business or social conversation, evinces the profound statesman and the accomplished gentleman. His first wife died in 1819: ten years after he lost his second, the Countess Beilstein; and in 1831 he married, for the third time, Countess Melanie Zichy Ferraris, his present wife, one of the most beautiful and charming of the Hungarian nobility. Two daughters by his first, one of whom is married to a Hungarian nobleman, one son by his second, and one daughter and son by his present Princess, grace his family circle. He holds too high a rank in the councils of his country, and is too firmly seated in the affections of his countrymen, to be envious of any, whilst his acknowledged merits and pure patriotism exalt him above the jealousy of others.

* Pronounced Metter*nik*.

Steamboat Disaster.—On the 27th ultimo the steamboat Old Hickory run upon a dam in the Ohio river, near the mouth of the Cumberland, and was expected to be a total loss. Passengers all safe, including the Hon. Henry Clay. A portion of the cargo would be saved. The boat cost $35,000. A considerable part of her was owned by the captain. The dam upon which she struck was placed there by the United States Government to deepen the channel; leaving a sluice of only 100 feet for the passage of boats, which sluice the Old Hickory missed by about fifteen feet. The shock was tremendous, and the consternation great, all fearing a total wreck.

REMARKS OF Mr. WENTWORTH, OF ILLINOIS,

On the Oregon Question—Wednesday, Jan. 14.

Mr. WENTWORTH said it was easy for gentlemen to rise on this floor and descant upon the glories of war or the blessings of peace. For one, he had nothing to say upon either. He would avoid the charge of bravado on one side, and timidity on the other. The question of declaring war was not before Congress. And we were at amity with all the nations of the earth, and consequently we had no peace to make. He had expressed his views in relation to this matter on several occasions before this, and it was difficult to find a politician who had not. For nearly thirty years the matter had been in agitation; and during the whole time the extrinsic consideration of peace or war had been dragged in, and used to retard the assertion of American rights. In all this controversy there was but one question, and that was, "Is Oregon ours?" If it is, we but act the part of justice when we claim our own; if it is not, then we should make no pretensions adversely to the party justly entitled to it. If it is all ours, then we should boldly but respectfully assert our rights to it all; if not all ours, then we should only take what is ours. This course would be alike honorable to us as men, as Christians, and as a nation. There was but one highminded course to pursue, and that was to do right, and leave consequences to themselves, to be provided for as they arose.

Entertaining these views, he had resolved to manifest his attachment to American rights by a silent vote on this question at this session, and should have done so but for the allusion to him by the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Rhett,) in relation to the vote given by him, the present Speaker, (Mr. Davis,) and the present presiding officer, (Mr. Tibbatts,) and about sixty other Democrats, against inserting this notice in the Oregon bill, and which no gentleman yet having spoken had explained. He would here state, however, that the reason for his silence was, that the people were beginning to believe that this subject was one that was forever to be talked about and never to be acted upon. He was afraid that the Oregon excitement was to be considered the American humbug, used to make Presidents, and to get men into Congress; but to go no further, because there was "a lion in the path." As long ago as he could remember, the politicians were talking and diplomatists negotiating on this subject; and the advances, if any, all the while, have been the wrong way. As Texas, the twin measure with this at the last session, was passed without discussion, he certainly hoped that Oregon would have secured the same courtesy; and he was at the commencement of this debate, and he now was, ready and anxious to limit the debate to a single day. Gentlemen were anxious to define their positions, and therefore were delaying this measure for weeks, and perhaps for months, when they could but know that their votes, ay or no, on the question of this notice, and upon a bill extending American jurisdiction to the Russian boundary, wou'd be the best definition that they could give. Early action on this question, one way or the other, was what the people expected, and what he (Mr. W.) would labor to promote. As was said in the case of Texas, he would reiterate as equally applicable to Oregon, the people have decided the case at the polls after a full hearing of all the parties, and it only remains for us to execute their judgment.

One gentleman has proposed to take Oregon on time. Well, sir, we have been taking it on time, or rather losing it on time, ever since 1818. When we began, we had twelve degrees and forty minutes of territory. We now have but seven. Great Britain has about thirty forts there, and we have none. Such has been the result of our workings on time. To give this notice, in the minds of gentlemen, would be to declare war. To pass any Oregon bill, or to send any troops there without the notice, would be to violate national faith. Thus they place us in a dilemma, the direct and sole tendency of which is to effect delay. Indeed, they say, some day take Oregon, but not now—forgetting that an independent people will never think it too soon to assert their rights when they find they have them. Every gentleman who has spoken but one (Mr. Winthrop) has said that we had a perfect title to all of Oregon, and that one has said that of the two, both being imperfect, ours was the best. When they say that much, they say enough to make any further delay on their part inexcusable. Having rights, the people will demand their maintenance; and the more those rights are endangered, and the greater the prospect of losing them, the more clamorous will they be for the most decisive action. Were our rights in doubt, delay would be excused; but knowing them, and openly avowing them, and yet bringing up the fear of war, and setting forth the terrors of the British force and British name as a reason for not asserting them, is nothing more nor less than national cowardice.

When a party cannot carry its points in one way, it is apt to try another; and I have noticed that the opposition here, when they cannot reach our better judgments from the weakness of their arguments, always try to affect our nerves by their panics; and it is but natural for them to do so, since they have failed in their trial of all other means. But the venerable gentleman from Massachusetts has told us that there would be no war; and he, from his superior knowledge, age, and experience, should be good authority with them. So that need not operate on us. But war or no war is not the question, and it should not be considered for one moment. Let us take Oregon now, and look to war when it arises. It is not for us to fear it, when the people who sent us here, and who will have to lose their money and lives in consequence of it, bid us onward in the execution of their own will.

When the admission of Texas was before us, (a country to which we had acquired no right except by the will of the occupants of the soil, who had revolted from their rightful government,) the question was not how shall we compromise this difficulty with Mexico, how much of Texas shall we have, but all said the whole or none, and we took it all; and the story is, that we took more than all by running to the Rio del Norte for the sake of a good boundary. This I sanctioned with my vote; and I now wish, and I call upon my Southern Texas friends to aid me, to let my patriotism have as full scope on our northern frontier as it had on the South. If it was wrong to cede away Texas in 1819, is it not equally so to cede away any portion of Oregon now? And if we have had such a struggle, as is too recent in our experience to describe now, to reannex that country against the will of the weak and distracted Government of Mexico, what will be the mighty struggle when the future inhabitants of surrendered Oregon, groaning under British oppression, shall demand this same just privilege? And such a demand is sure to come. My doctrine is, "put not off the evil day"—meet the crisis in the face; do justice whilst it is in your power, and leave consequences to consequences.

Mr. W. wanted to call the attention of the House—and, indeed, that was the main object of his rising—and more particularly of the new members, to an explanation of the occurrence in the last Congress alluded to by the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Rhett.) Mr. W. said it was his opinion, and that of a majority of the party with which he had ever acted, that if the notice and the bill were sent to the Senate separately, one if not both would pass. There were some Senators who would vote for one and not the other. He was for both, and wanted that course pursued that would secure both. But if he could not have one, he did not wish to prejudice the other. By looking at the journals, it would be seen that all who voted against putting the notice in the bill were Democrats. After the notice was in the bill, they, however, did not forsake the bill on that account. Now look at those who voted against the bill on its final passage. All their names are recorded in favor of inserting this notice. Several Democrats voted to put the notice in the bill because they did not wish to be put in a false position at home, where the circumstances could not be explained, but yet entertained serious doubts as to its propriety, for fear of its endangering the passage of the bill. Here, then, are the facts: all those who went against putting the notice in the bill, finally went for it, whilst all those who finally went against the bill went for inserting the notice. The fears of its friends were realized, and the bill was defeated in the Senate.

Mr. HOLMES called Mr. W. to order.

Mr. WENTWORTH sat down, and demanded the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN desired the gentleman from South Carolina to state his point of order.

Mr. HOLMES stated that it was out of order to allude to the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN overruled him, and said the gentleman was alluding to the Senate of last session.

Mr. WENTWORTH said that was the gentleman's point probably. "*De mortuis nil nisi bonum?*"

Mr. HOLMES. "*Nil mortuis?*"

Mr. WENTWORTH would leave the Latin with the gentleman, and go to Oregon again. Well, sir, after passing this House by an overwhelming majority, the bill was lost in the Senate by two votes only, and those two were the votes from South Carolina; and he presumed there was not a gentleman in this House but believed that, if the two measures had been kept separate, one or both would have passed. On mature deliberation, he was satisfied that he pursued the proper course in voting to keep the two measures separate. No man who went with him regrets it, whilst there are those who voted to united them who would not do so again, if they had the matter to do over again.

Mr. W. alluded to the fact that the South and West went together for Texas, and he hoped they would go together for Oregon. The West certainly so expected. If they did not go together there was a class of politicians who would make a great deal of capital out of it. The non-slaveholding Democrats had gone for Texas—Mr. W. among them. He was sorry there were slaves there; but, notwithstanding, he was glad he voted for it. Oregon was free from slaves, and he loved it the more because it was so. Now, after annexing a foreign slave community, what would be said of us if we give up five degrees and forty minutes of a non-slaveholding country, which every member who had spoken conceded to belong to us? Already have certain politicians and papers began to predict that the South, having used the West to get Texas, would now abandon it, and go against Oregon.

Mr. YANCEY here inquired whether the gentleman from Illinois meant to intimate that there was any bargain between the South and West—that the South should vote for Oregon if the West would vote for Texas? He would ask him, as a gentleman, to say whether he (Mr. Yancey) was implicated in any such bargain?

Mr. WENTWORTH replied that he had not said that there was any such bargain. To do so would only implicate himself as a party to it, after having voted for Texas. He only alluded to the course pursued by the opponents of the annexation of Texas, to ruin politically every non-slaveholding Democrat who had supported it.

Mr. HOUSTON, of Alabama. If it will not be too much trouble, will the gentleman from Illinois point out those who were parties to this supposed compact? for there may be some straggling votes of the South in favor of the notice.

Mr. WENTWORTH had made no charge of bargaining, nor charge of any kind. He would impeach acts, but never motives, leaving them to the God of Heaven, who alone knew them. What he had said was rather an exhortation to the South, than a charge upon it. He exhorted it to come up and meet the Oregon question fully and frankly, and so belie the charge that it would not as quickly extend the area of freedom on the north as the south.

Mr. HOUSTON rose to explain.

[A voice: "Don't be interrupted. They will consume your hour."]

Mr. WENTWORTH. It is no interruption. I have said all I wished; and if the gentlemen wish to turn the remainder of the hour allotted to me into an inquiry meeting, I am willing. I will hear the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. HOUSTON. What I did in relation to Texas, I did for the question and for the country. What I may do as to Oregon, I shall do for the question itself and for the country. I have nothing to do with any compact between sections of country, for the adoption of any particular measures.

Mr. WENTWORTH. I think my remarks are productive of good, and I would gladly hear the whole South in the brief space remaining to me, if possible. If the Southern Democrats now went against Oregon, it might not injure them; but it would seriously injure their Northern brethren who had aided them in getting Texas, supposing there was no doubt of their fidelity on the Oregon question.

Mr. W. said the whole South, and more particularly South Carolina, prided itself on its consistency. He now wished to call the attention of his Southern friends to one fact, and he was willing to yield the floor for an explanation. By looking at the bill that passed the House at the last session of Congress, it will be seen that it extended our jurisdiction to 54° and 40′, and had this notice in besides. Now, how could a Southern man preserve his prided consistency by going for 49°, and against the notice, after having voted for that bill? What has occurred to lessen our title since, whilst we have had the masterly and irrefutable argument of the Secretary of State to strengthen it?

Mr. R. CHAPMAN (to whom Mr. Wentworth yielded the floor for explanation) said that he had often during this debate heard the charge intimated of a bargain between the South and the West; that the South was to go for the whole of Oregon *now*, because the West went for *Texas*. He had not considered this imputation heretofore worthy of notice; but as others had considered the charge worthy of explanation, he considered it due to himself to say that he never heard of such an understanding or bargain. He certainly had no part in such an understanding. He opposed all such, and would now denounce it as corrupt, if he believed any such existed; but this he could not believe for a moment. Mr. C. said, that so far from having had any thing to do with such an agreement, he had (almost alone of his party) voted at the last session not only against the notice, but the bill that passed this House. He voted against it mainly on account of the notice, though there were other provisions very objectionable. Mr. C. said that he hoped this disclaimer would in future acquit him from such a charge. As one of the friends of Texas, he felt it his duty to protest against such an imputation. It had not been made against him on account of his vote last year, nor would he subject himself to such an imputation by any vote he might give on the question now under consideration.

Mr. WENTWORTH knew well the course of the gentleman from Alabama. He was one of the very few Southern Democrats who voted against the bill of the last session. It was to others that he spoke. He wanted those who voted for the bill of the last session to be consistent, and demand now all they did then. He did not want to have it said that, upon the question of adding territory to the South, they were the most ultra Democrats and real propagandists; whilst when you only asked them to claim our own on the North, even John Quincy Adams, with all the charges of Federalism against him, was more of a Democrat than they. He had made no charge of a violated bargain, for he knew of none. What he had said was to make the South consistent with itself, and not to furnish arguments to Northern abolitionists, with which they might injure its Northern allies in the glorious acquisition of Texas. If there was any censure in this matter, it was not for him or any member on this floor to inflict it; but it was for gentlemen to censure themselves by their own votes when the day of trial comes, if ever it does, and the prospect for it seemed rather poor now.

Mr. W. differed with some members as to the result of a war, if one should come. He thought the Canadians would be the principal sufferers; but he would not allude to this subject. He had no right to anticipate a war whilst we were in the discharge of our rightful duties. The goddess of justice is represented as being blind. She is just, and fears not. She can see no British lion, nor British bayonets, nor British war steamers. Her decrees go forth, affect whom they will: weakness and strength are alike to her. And we should consider ourselves as sworn jurors to try the claims of our country to Oregon, and should be blind to all the consequences of our verdict, provided that it is only a just one. Knowing our rights, which all here admit to be unquestionable, we should dare maintain them.

Dr. McCAW, of Richmond.

The Richmond papers publish the obituary notice of Dr. McCaw. In reading this obituary we were struck with the heroic conduct mentioned in the following extract, which will no doubt prove as interesting to our readers as it did to us:

"When the appalling burning of the Richmond Theatre took place, in the winter of 1811, Dr. McCaw was present. At the cry of fire, recollecting the great crowd and narrow lobby, he leaped from the side box on the stage, in the hope of ecuring the escape of his party behind it. Pressing the curtain aside, he discovered such a mass of flame as most effectually cut off all egress in that way. Returning instantly by a backward leap, and supporting his wife, he forced his way to the famous east window, around which he found clustering and suffocating a crowd of persons, whose every effort had proved unsuccessful in opening the shutters, which were strongly barricaded on the outside. By an effort of strength almost supernatural, he dashed to pieces the obstacle, and the first gush of fresh air gave life to numbers who would have perished without it. Taking his stand then by the high window, he announced his determination to secure the safety of every female before any man should escape. This he carried into effect, and then (literally surrounded with flames) assisted the men in the same way. At last, after saving very many lives, his clothing reduced to a crisp, as the floor sunk beneath his feet, he leaped from the window, the last human being that escaped through that outlet. His fall produced an injury of the thigh that rendered him powerless for motion, and he lay under the wall of the burning building until his own son (a mere lad) recognised his voice, crying for aid, and dragged him down hill, out of danger from the falling wall. Months of severe pain followed, during the first weeks of which he could not permit the removal of a single piece of his clothing; when at length this was done, the very flannel next his skin was found burnt, and a universal cicatrix of the back evidenced the amount of heat he had borne, the painful effects of the burn having been completely concealed by the greater suffering from the torn muscles of the thigh. The heroism of this conduct was only equalled by the modesty which prevented his giving the details for publication, often solicited from him."

Conscientiousness.—The Salem Register tells a creditable story of a gentleman of Boston, who, twenty years ago, was an endorser upon a note of a failing firm, which afterwards settled and received a discharge from all its creditors by paying seventy-six per cent. The note belonged to one of the banks of Salem. Last week, the endorser, Mr. John Williams, of Boston, called upon the directors, recalled the transaction to their memory, and paid up the amount due, with interest, which was, in all, $1,450.

Case of Conscience.—Some years ago a dispute between two merchants was submitted to arbitration, and eminent lawyers were employed on both sides. When the case came to be submitted, it was quite plain that the right was altogether on one side. The eminent character of the lawyer on the opposite side made the referees curious to hear what he would say. When the reference broke up, one of the referees walked along Broadway with the counsellor, and, after talking over some small matters, said to him: "Mr. E———, I was very much entertained and interested with your speech this afternoon, and now I wish you would tell me how you think it had any thing to do with the case?" "Poh!" said the lawyer, giving the referee a rough push, "when a client comes with a large fee and no case, what can a lawyer do?"

Journal of Commerce.

A Good One.—The *Floridian*, printed at Clinton, boasts of receiving the President's message by overland express. It was thus done, saith the editor:

"An Irishman lately arrived in New Orleans was employed to carry packages and messages for the —— office. Being ordered to carry our messages to the steamer Clinton, he started out, thinking it was some place in the city—finding himself at fault, he requested a countryman to inform him where Clinton was? Taking the direction literally, he procured a map of the State, on examination of which he informed his friend it was but a short distance up the river, and as he was wanting exercise he would walk a part of the way with him. So, on foot they started and arrived here on Saturday last, *in nine days from New Orleans by the overland route.*"
